

## REMARKS

By the present amendment, the specification as been amended to correct the "Related References" data so that such data is consistent with that provided in the parent application.

In the Office Action mailed April 23, 2002, claims 1 and 25-27 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,392B1; claims 28-31 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,182,392B1, in view of Weder (U.S. Patent No. 5,603,406); claims 1 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gregoire (U.S. Patent No. 3,924,354); claims 25, 27, 29, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregoire (U.S. Patent No. 3,924,254); and claims 26 and 30 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form so as to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if a proper terminal disclaimer were entered and a showing that the subject application was commonly owned with U.S. Patent No. 6,182,392B1 and U.S. Patent No. 5,603,406.

In order to expedite issuance of a patent on the inventive concepts recited in claims 26 and 30, and without commenting or acquiescing to the various rejections set forth in the Office Action concerning claims 1, 25, 27, 28, 29 and 31, Applicant has cancelled such claims, without prejudice. Therefore, the various rejections of such claims is rendered moot in light of the cancellation of such claims and thus no comments concerning the rejections are deemed necessary to be fully responsive to the Office Action.


In addition, claims 26 and 30 have been cancelled and rewritten as newly added claims 32 and 33, and as such, include all of the limitations of their respective base claims. In addition, a timely executed terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith, along with a certificate showing that the subject application is commonly owned with U.S. Patent No. 6,182,392B1 and U.S. Patent No. 5,603,406.

### SUMMARY

This is intended to be a full and complete response to the Office Action dated April 23, 2002. It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the filing of the terminal disclaimer herewith, along with the certificate showing common ownership of the patents in question and the subject application, new claims 32 and 33 are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection to such claims and pass same to issue.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning newly added claims 32 and 33, the terminal disclaimer and certificate submitted herewith, or the remarks set forth herein, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's attorney in an effort to resolve such matters. This is intended to be a complete and full response to the Office Action mailed April 23, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,



Nicholas D. Rouse, Reg. No. 36,992  
DUNLAP, CODDING & ROGERS, P.C.  
9400 North Broadway, Suite 420  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73114  
Telephone: (405)478-5344  
Facsimile: (405)478-5349  
Attorney for Applicant